

# **EXHIBIT C**

Jun-15-2006 03:38 PM Citak and Citak 12127592979

2/16

DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE  
SUPREME COURT, APPELLATE DIVISION  
FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT  
61 BROADWAY  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10006  
(212) 401-0800

RECEIVED

2006 DEC 23 PM 12:20

Thomas J. Cahill  
Chief Counsel

DEPARTMENTAL  
DISCIPLINARY  
COMMITTEE

DATE: 12/21/05

Complainant(s):

Mr.(X) Ms.( ) Mrs.( ) MARTON STUART E 231  
Last First Initial  
Address: 200 EAST 27th ST  
New York NY 10016  
City State Zip Code  
Telephone: Home: (917) 748-5523 Business: ( ) Use same NR

Attorney Complained of:

Mr.(X) Ms.( ) Mrs.( ) CITAK DONALD 9454  
Last First Initial  
Address: 270 MADISON AVE.  
NY NY 10016  
City State Zip Code  
Telephone: Work: Home: (212) 759-9585 Business: ( )

Complaints to other agencies:

Have you filed a complaint concerning this matter with another Bar Association, District Attorney's Office or any other agency? NO.

If so, name of agency:

Action taken by agency:

Court action against attorney complained of:

Have you brought a civil or criminal action against this attorney? NO.

If so, name of court:

Index No.:

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY OR TYPE IN ENGLISH

Start from the beginning and be sure to tell why you went to the attorney, when you had contact with the attorney, what happened each time you contacted the attorney, and what it was that the attorney did wrong. Provide specific dates for each important event. Please, with this form, send copies of all important papers, including all papers that you received from the attorney.

Jun-15-2006 03:38 PM Citak and Citak 12127592979


3/16

COMPLAINT:

IN APRIL 2000 I HIRED CITAK + CITAK TO REPRESENT ME AGAINST A CONTRACTOR THAT WALKED AWAY FROM RENOVATING MY HOME, IN VIOLATION OF A CONTRACT, IN THE MANY MONTHS AFTERWARDS, DON CITAK, ESQ. FILED A LAWSUIT, WHICH WAS DISMISSED BECAUSE THE COURT SAID THE CASE HAD TO BE ARBITRATED. MR. CITAK FILED FOR ARBITRATION BUT, APPARENTLY, THE AAA DID NOT TAKE THE CASE BECAUSE THE CONTRACTOR REFUSED TO ACCEPT THEM. I WRITE "APPARENTLY" BECAUSE MR. CITAK NEVER INFORMED ME THAT THE AAA WOULDN'T TAKE THE CASE, (I FOUND OUT MYSELF BY CONTACTING THE AAA). THE ENTIRE PROCESS WITH MR. CITAK WAS SLOW AND HAD MANY DELAYS. MOST IMPORTANTLY, FROM MARCH 2004 -- SEPTEMBER 2004, I MADE REPEATED REQUESTS TO MR. CITAK ASKING FOR A STATUS REPORT -- HE NEVER RESPONDED TO ME. MY LAST REQUEST WAS A "DEMAND" SENT BY CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED; IT WAS IGNORED. IN THE PROCESS, MR. CITAK STATED THAT IF THE CONTRACTOR REFUSED ARBITRATION, MR. CITAK WOULD RETURN TO THE COURT. AGAIN, IT APPEARS THAT THIS DID NOT HAPPEN.

ENCLOSED PLEASE FIND A DETAILED LIST OF CORRESPONDENCE AND COPIES OF DOCUMENTS, LETTERS, ETC. I APPRECIATE YOUR EFFORTS TO UNDERSTAND WHY MR. CITAK IGNORES ME AND HAS NOT RETURNED TO COURT TO REPRESENT ME. THANK YOU.

UNSIGNED COMPLAINTS WILL NOT BE PROCESSED.



Signature